APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,399	12/06/2001	Arturo A. Rodriguez	A-7492	2909

5642   7590   08/25/2008

SCIENTIFIC-ATLANTA, INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
5030 SUGARLOAF PARKWAY
LAWRENCEVILLE, GA 30044

EXAMINER
SALCE, JASON P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/25/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOmail@sciatl.com

Continuation of Item 11 from Advisory

Applicant argues that Ukai fails to teach that each element or alleged parameter in Figure 3 of Ukai does not have an associated user preference.

The examiner disagrees and notes that the claim limitation, "*determining a user preference for each of the plurality of viewing parameters*" is broad and does not require that every single viewing parameter in the television system of Ukai contain a user preference. The examiner is interpreting the limitation "viewing parameters" as the total view time period 404 in Figure 4, wherein the view time period represents how interested the user in the television program based on how long the user watches the television program. Applicant has interpreted viewing parameters on the table disclosed in Figure 3, however, as clearly stated in the Office Action on Page 3, viewing parameters are being interpreted as the view time period 404 in Figure 4. Therefore, Ukai clearly teaches determining a user preference (**view time period 404 in Figure 4**) for each of the plurality of viewing parameters (**each program name in Figure 4**).

Applicant also argues that Ukai fails to teach a digital home communication terminal.

The examiner disagrees and notes Column 4, Lines 8-35 (**specifically Column 4, Lines 28-33**) for teaching the TV receiving device can record television programs in memory means that includes an optical disk (**which is clearly a digital signal**), therefore Ukai clearly teaches a digital home communications terminal. Further, Ukai

teaches that the TV receiving device can receive digital signals from a digital

broadcasting system **(see Column 15, Lines 4-5)**, therefore Ukai clearly teaches that

the TV receiving device is a digital home communication terminal, wherein the

communication is evidenced by the person interacting with the TV receiving device

through a remote control.

Applicant also argues that Ukai fails to teach using statistical analysis.

The examiner disagrees and notes that Ukai clearly teaches performing

statistical analysis on multiple program view scores in order to determine a mean view

score **(see Figure 5 and Column 5, 40-55)**. The examiner notes that a mean score is

a classic calculation used in the art of statistics **(see**

http://www.statistics.com/resources/glossary/m/meanscore.php).

Applicant also argues that Ukai fails to teach the use of artificial intelligence

technology. The examiner disagrees and notes that Ukai clearly teaches the use of

artificial intelligence by the calculations performed in Figures 5-7 and 12-16 for the TV

receiving device automatically deciding a user's favorite programs based on the view

scores recorded by the system. The examiner notes that by automatically making

decisions for the user in regards to his/her preferred programming, Ukai clearly teaches

the use of artificial intelligence **(see http://www.merriam-**

webster.com/dictionary/artificial+intelligence).

Applicant also argues that Ukai fails to teach a non-volatile memory.

The examiner disagrees and notes that the storage means 108 stores the TV program selection support program 200 in a memory area that cannot be overwritten (**see Column 4, Lines 21-33**), otherwise if the program was corrupted by being overwritten, the system could not function. Since Ukai teaches memory devices that cannot be overwritten (**such as an optical disk**), Ukai clearly teaches a non-volatile memory device.

In regards to claims 25 and 74, the examiner has taken Official Notice to the fact that preference data can be stored at a headend. Applicant has traversed this rejection.

Alexander et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931) teaches that user preferences can be transmitted back to a headend for further analysis (**Column 29, Lines 12-36**).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the TV analysis process, as taught by Ukai, to perform the analysis at the headend, as taught by Alexander, for the purpose of providing a lower cost TV receiving device that contains a cheaper processor and memory devices since there would be no need for processor intensive tasks (constantly processing and updating user preferences).

In regards to claims 46-48 and 95-97, the examiner has taken Official Notice to the fact that parental control programs commonly reside on television receiver devices.

Block et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,384) teaches a parental control program resident on a television receiver device **(see elements 100 and 110 in Figure 1**).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the TV receiving device, as taught by Ukai, to contain a parental control program, as taught by Alexander, for the purpose of providing a means for users to gain by being able to make informed choices **(see Column 2, Lines 42-49 of Block**).